

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Submitted herewith please find 2 replacement drawing sheet in compliance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.84. The Examiner is respectfully requested to acknowledge receipt of these drawings. The submitted drawings are intended to replace the drawings previously submitted on April 19, 2004.

Attachment: Three Replacement Drawing Sheets (FIGS. 2 and 3)

REMARKS

I. Formal Matters

Claims 1-22 are all the claims pending in the present Application. By this Amendment Applicants hereby amend claims 1, 2 and 3 to include the feature of prior pending claim 23. Additionally, Applicants hereby cancel claim 23. No new issues are raised by this Amendment.

Applicants note that the Examiner has also objected to claim 3. Specifically, the Examiner requested that “each said guide blocks” should be changed to “each of said guide blocks” for better clarity. However, Applicants respectfully note that, in light of the Amendment of April 9, 2007, the claim refers to “each said guide **block**,” in the singular form, and not “guide **blocks**” as the Examiner asserts. As such, Applicants respectfully assert that the claim limitation is sufficiently clear without further amendment.

II. Claim Rejections
Rejection under Bischoff

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-3, 13-15 and 19-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Bischoff et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,237,437). Applicants respectfully disagree.

With respect to claim 1, this claim has been amended to incorporate the elements of claim 23. As such, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection of claim 1 under Bischoff is now moot. However, the Examiner has rejected claim 23, *inter alia*, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being anticipated by Biskeborn et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,883,770). Applicants respectfully disagree.

With respect to amended claim 1, Biskeborn fails to teach, or even suggest a “magnetic head assembly ... [wherein] the edge of said servo signal recording head and the outer edge of said guide block [are] chamfered.”

Instead, Biskeborn discloses a magnetic tape recording head wherein the wrap angle of the tape around the recording head is controlled using the surfaces 26 of outriggers 24 and 25 (See e.g. FIG. 4). That is, the wrap angle is controlled by the angle formed by the intersection of the outriggers 24 and 25 and the flat surfaces 26. Further, Biskeborn teaches that “the size of the wrap angle may be precisely controlled by lapping flat surfaces 26 of the outriggers 24 and 25 to a precise dimension in a common plane.” (See Col. 4, ll. 60-63). To this regard, Biskeborn discloses that the angle is “very small,” from about 0.5 to 2.5 degrees. (See Col. 4, ll. 39-40).

Initially, Applicants note that the Examiner has taken the position that the intersection of the outriggers 24 and 25 with the surfaces 26 constitutes the “outer edge” of the guiding block. (See Office Action, page 12). Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner’s position.

It is well known that, when examining the claims of an application, “[a]ll words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art.” MPEP § 2143.03; see also *In re Wilson*, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385, 165 USPQ 494, 496 (CCPA 1970). Additionally, “[w]hen evaluating claims for obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103, all the imitations of the claims must be considered and given weight. MPEP § 2143.03; see also *Ex parte Grasselli*, 231 USPQ 393 (Bd. App. 1983) *aff’d mem.* 738 F.2d 453 (Fed. Cir. 1984).

The Examiner’s interpretation of the “outer edge” of the guiding block limitation of claim 23, now claim 1, effectively gives no weight to the word “outer.” That is, under the Examiner’s interpretation, there is no distinction between an “outer edge” and just an “edge.” As

discussed in the previous Amendment, Biskeborn, at most, refers to an angle formed between the head and the edge formed in the middle of the guide block surface defined by the outriggers 24 and 25.

Nevertheless, even if, *arguendo*, the Examiner's position was correct, Applicants respectfully assert that Biskeborn still fails to teach, or suggest, all of the limitations recited in the amended claim 1.

For example, with respect to amended claim 1, the Examiner suggests that "one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to have had the recording head edge of Biskeborn be chamfered since such reduces media wear." (See Office Action, page 10). Applicants respectfully disagree.

It is well known that "[i]t is improper to combine references where the references teach away from their combination. *In re Grasselli*, 713 F.2d 731, 743, 218 USPQ 769, 779 (Fed. Cir. 1983)." As discussed above, the wrap angle in Biskeborn is precisely controlled using the intersection between the flat surfaces 26 and the outriggers 24 and 25. However, if the intersection between the flat surface 24 and the outrigger 24 or 25 was chamfered, as the Examiner suggests, the wrap angle would no longer stay the same. In fact, the wrap angle would fall outside the disclosed, very small, wrap angle of Biskeborn.

For at least this reason, Applicants respectfully assert that one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to chamfer the edges of the guide block of Biskeborn, as proposed by the Examiner. For at least the above reasons, claim 1 should be allowable over the cited art of record.

Moreover, with regard to claim 1, the Examiner has refused to give any patentable weight to the “guide block which is ... slightly set back from said sliding surface of said servo signal recording head so that said magnetic tape slides on an edge of said servo signal recording head and on an outer edge of said guide block.” Applicants respectfully disagree.

Specifically, the Examiner asserts that “the limitations pertaining to a ‘magnetic tape’ can only be accorded weight to the extent that they affect the structure of the magnetic head assembly.” Applicants respectfully assert that this is indeed the case. That is, the magnetic tape, as recited in claim 1, affects the structure of the magnetic head assembly.

With regard to the structure of the magnetic head assembly, the magnetic tape, as recited in claim 1, controls the position of the recording head and the guide block in relation to one another. In other words, the magnetic tape further defines the “guide block [being] slightly set back from said sliding surface of said servo signal recording head” limitation of claim 1. In view of the above limitation of claim 1, the guide block is positioned in relation to the head in such a way that, a magnetic tape, which is placed across the guide block and recording head, slides on the edge of said guide block and on the edge of the recording head.

As such, Applicants respectfully assert that the arguments set forth in the Amendment of April 9, 2007, with regard to this claim limitation remain applicable.

With regard to independent claims 2 and 3, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 2 and 3 are allowable for at least the reasons analogous to those recited with respect to claim 1. As claims 13, 14 and 15 depend from claims 1, 2 and 3 respectively, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 13, 14 and 15 are patentable at least by virtue of their respective dependencies. With regard to claims 19-22, these claims are dependent from independent claim 1. As such,

Applicants respectfully assert that these claims are allowable at least by virtue of their dependence from claim 1.

Additionally, Applicants respectfully assert that the limitations recited in claims 19-22 are not intended use limitations, as the Examiner contends, for reasons analogous to those recited with respect to claim 1 above. As such, Applicants request for the Examiner to give weight to the limitations recited in these claims and to examine these claims on the merits.

Additional Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-6, 13-15 and 19-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Biskeborn et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,883,770). Applicants respectfully disagree.

With regard to the rejection of claims 1-3, 13-15 and 19-22 under Biskeborn, Applicants have already addressed these rejections, as set forth above.

Additionally, with regard to independent claims 4, 5 and 6, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 4, 5 and 6 depend from claims 1, 2 and 3 respectively. As such, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 4, 5 and 6 are patentable at least by virtue of their respective dependencies.

Additional Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner has also rejected claims 7-12, 16-18 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being anticipated by Biskeborn et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,883,770). Applicants respectfully disagree.

With respect to claims 7, 10 and 16, these claims depend from claim 1, claims 8, 11 and 17 depend from claim 2 and claims 9, 12 and 18 depend from claim 3. As such, Applicants

respectfully assert that claims 7-12 and 16-18 are patentable at least by virtue of their respective dependencies.

With respect to claim 23, this claim has been canceled. As such, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection of claim 23 is now moot.

VII. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

This Application is being filed via the USPTO Electronic Filing System (EFS). Applicants herewith petition the Director of the USPTO to extend the time for reply to the above-identified Office Action for an appropriate length of time if necessary. Any fee due under 37 U.S.C. § 1.17(a) is being paid via the USPTO Electronic Filing System (EFS). The USPTO is also directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.


Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER


Susan P. Pan
Registration No. 41,239

Date: September 12, 2007